

Doc 502

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
JUL 2 1959
L. R. 1

ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER

May 15, 1959

1930—1959

Letter No. 4545 ?

"Collective Security"—For What?

THE political decline of the United States can be traced by slogans, like "agrarian reform" to pinpoint our neutrality during the conquest of China by the communists, and "flexibility" to pinpoint apathy during the coming sell-out of Germany.

It is easy to misinterpret this apparent power of slogans. It does not prove stupidity of the voters. Actually, the slogan is the small visible tip of the organized political blocs which are struggling beneath the surface to take over the political power as the old parties decay in all western countries.

"COLLECTIVE security" is one of the most important of these slogans, whose real significance is the skill and organization of the political blocs which use them for currency. It is silly to consider the slogans of the collectivists without considering the sources of their political power, because we must defeat the power system, not the slogan.

In December 1937, an important speech was made by C. A. Hathaway, editor of the communist *Daily Worker*. This gives the best insight into the meaning of "collective security."

The speaker warmly praised President Roosevelt's "quarantine the aggressor" speech of the preceding month, in which he attacked the Nazis and Fascists as aggressors, and urged other nations to unite to "quarantine" them. Hathaway said:

"War in any part of the world directly endangers our own peace and our own security. It has served to reopen the fundamental discussion of isolationism versus collective security as the basis for our foreign policy."

He urged a foreign policy of concerted action by all the "democratic" nations, with the aim of protecting "world peace and democracy." He praised President Roosevelt's speech for uniting the "peace-loving" nations, and for associating world peace with democracy. He bitterly opposed the neutrality legislation and other efforts in Con-

gress to prevent our country from being swept into war as it had been in 1917. He worked out the technique of identifying all opponents of concerted action by the "democracies" against the "aggressors" as isolationists, and identified the isolationists with Big Business, Fascism, Toryism, and friendship for Germany and Japan. "The real issue," he said, "is *collective security*, before it is too late."

The editor of the *Daily Worker* clearly equated the "aggressor nations" with opponents of the Soviet Union. He promised Roosevelt whole-hearted support, if he based his foreign policy "squarely on the policies proposed in that speech."

Of course, there was a great deal of backing and filling on both sides between 1937 and the adoption by Congress of the policy of "collective security" implemented by the United Nations Charter. Can anyone miss the similarity between that speech and the slogans of today?

IT was about 1942, when the first outward signs appeared that a movement was under way to commit us to collective security at the end of the Second World War, but to do so without permitting the people or their representatives in Congress to have a voice in the matter. Perhaps the best evidence of this movement was the report of the Committee for a Just and Durable Peace, to the Federal Council of Churches, which laid down the essential steps in recreating an international government, and told the assembled representatives from all over the United States to go back to their communities and carry the new political gospel with them. About the same time, academic studies by college professors belittling our earlier foreign policies began to flow from the presses. Columnists were given helpful background material. The heat was on.

Let us make clear, at once, that 98 per cent of the people involved were honestly working for a

"just and durable peace." The political problems of today come from movements in which 98 per cent of the members have one goal and 2 per cent have a quite different goal—but know exactly where they want to go and how to get there.

Years passed before most Americans understood what a perfect tool these "do-gooders" had found by stretching the treaty clause of the Constitution. This let the President or his agents make any changes in domestic policy—however contrary to the Constitution—provided only that the changes were put into a treaty, or (worse) into executive agreements to make tight commitments under treaties loosely worded for that very purpose.

THE over-all design of the new order was labelled "collective security." The phrase is used repeatedly, and almost nobody asks what it means.

Its advocates tell us "collective security" is the alternative to isolation. They picture the embattled conservatives hiding behind a stone wall labelled Fortress America, and the suggestion is clearly implied that the defenders expect to use bows and arrows to repel missiles and ICBM's. Hoover, Taft, Jenner, and others have been repeatedly accused of "isolationism," meaning the retreat to Fortress America, although there is not a single word in all their statements to indicate that they held any such idea. Senator Vandenberg was so terrified by the accusation that he veered from being one of the ablest critics of the internationalist conspiracy to a docile instrument for confusing Republicans and anti-New Deal Democrats.

It is stupid to accept our opponents' definition of our position. Why let Franklin Roosevelt and Dean Acheson have the last word on the foreign policy of the conservatives? What is the true meaning of our historic position?

American foreign policy, from Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin to Wilson and Roosevelt, was not "isolationism" in any honest meaning of the term. Our leaders insisted, not on going it alone, but on something quite different. They wished to be free to decide, when new crises arose, with whom we would cooperate. Washington's farewell address, and the deep-rooted belief which it expressed, said that we did not wish to get into Europe's quarrels if we could help it. We wanted complete freedom for the United States to make its future choices, in terms of its own national interest. We would not be bound, beforehand, to a rigid organization, within which we would not be free to use the sole criterion—what is for the best interests of the United States.

"Collective security," at its best, means that we must decide, at one moment of history, to what

system of alliances and territorial agreements we shall be committed. We forego all right to decide that the future is a new adventure, and freedom of choice is essential to life.

That is "collective security" at its best. "Collective security," as it was achieved in 1942-1948, in secrecy, by perversion of our Constitution, in clouds of propaganda, is not its best. It cannot be managed like our limited government by citizens who have other work to do. It must be managed by full-time professionals, with a cold and calculating interest in power. It may commit us without our knowledge to objectives entirely contrary to American interests. The machine which directs it may exert power over all political decisions, domestic and international.

Our government has been supporting "collective security" for some eighteen years. Is it collective? Is it security?

The promise of a world organized in peace and order is hardly fulfilled. The world is all divided into three parts—communist, neutralist, and what can politely be called anti-communist. Within the "anti-communist" group are many factions, as we can see from the frantic reiteration today that the allies are in full agreement over Berlin and the approaching summit conference.

The world is rapidly organizing itself into regional blocs which are moving toward new and deadlier rivalries.

Americans have not been watching this development of new empires to take the place of the old colonial empires, which were shattered by World War II and buried by the communists.

Obviously, the communists themselves have the greatest of the new colonial empires. They have occupied a vast belt of formerly free nations, from Poland to Romania, and they are now leap-frogging from their conquered territory into the vulnerable Middle East. In Asia, they captured Mainland China and use it as a beachhead to probe Indian, Southeast Asia, Free China, Japan, and Korea for weak spots.

The tensions which will probably develop later between the Russian and Chinese communists do not help us now.

THAT is not all. The political struggle in France was largely a struggle for direction of the French Empire in Africa, which is as populous as, much larger than, and infinitely richer than continental France itself. De Gaulle knew the French Empire because he recruited the first fighters for Free France from her African possessions. The words "oil in the Sahara" should alone warn us of the changing balance of power. The Germans and

the Benelux nations benefit, by way of the Common Market.

Britain has for years been building an empire in Africa, to replace the one she lost in Asia. Why should she oppose Red China, when she can get so much more profit by building up vast new colonies which will supply raw materials to her industrial machine, at lower wage and capital costs than her lost colonies in Asia?

In these years when our partners have been busy reviving colonialism on new and cheaper lands, we have consistently followed a policy of insulting and outraging the one continental area which is tied to us by history, geography and common problems of defense. It is almost impossible to see, through the fogs of propaganda, what has been going on in Latin America. Someone somewhere in our Government has been systematically weakening our bonds with Latin America during the same years in which we have been giving our wealth and energy to build up the "undeveloped" lands the other great powers are attaching to their imperial systems.

Our anti-communist friends in Asia have been "leashed" like dogs. Spain and other anti-communist countries in Europe are insulted in communist jargon.

Meanwhile, the United Nations has become increasingly an agency for conversion of internal political, economic and welfare activities to world government on the socialist model, as its role in international relations becomes more futile.

IS true "collective security" a myth? Is it weakening the United States? Is it weakening our natural allies in our own hemisphere? Is the "collective security" agency, the United Nations, gradually extending a network of collectivist internationalist controls over the domestic programs of the nations—trade, banking, labor, education, culture, welfare, communications? Is the pretense of "collective security" a shield for the Soviet Union?

It is time someone in the United States took a stand for America. There is no use wasting time answering the old shibboleths. What Franklin Roosevelt said about the "isolationists" is not important. The question is: What will a country of under 200 million people do, when the other great powers have completed their new empires and we have totally divorced ourselves from the group of republics in the New World, which Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and John Quincy Adams urged us to cleave to?

Why wait until the collectivist net of the United Nations and its agencies is drawn so tight we can no longer struggle free?

From Our Special Correspondent in South Africa

I doubt if all of your propaganda—excellent though it is—can awaken the people sufficiently to change the apparent course of events. Things have been allowed to drift too far. Under Roosevelt, Truman and, last but not least, Eisenhower, America has sown the wind and now must reap the inevitable whirlwind. America's leaders and people became very smug and went to sleep. While the Soviets were building up enormous and highly efficient scientific and technological research systems and learning to apply their findings, America lagged; and, in education, the emphasis shifted from fundamentals to frills.

Russia is progressing far faster than America in these fields and it is doubtful whether the latter can ever catch up. While at any time over some 20 to 30 years, the U.S.A. could have blotted out the Russians, she allowed them to develop to the point where they can blot out the U.S.A. and the Free World and, possibly, get themselves blotted out at the same time. She has allowed Soviet industry to expand to the point where Russia will soon be able, by planned dumping of equipment, goods and agricultural products, to prevent any real recovery in world prices. She will be able to break the world price of practically any commodity at will by dumping a comparatively small amount thereof. She can then, by using secret agents of her satellites, buy back at bargain prices more than she has dumped. She does not need a war to win.

Another simply wonderful idea of the Americans is that they should help other countries, especially the backward, undeveloped ones, to develop their own industries, install or expand their power supplies, raise their standards of living and by the use of these or other methods to become independent of American help. In other words, they deliberately set out to destroy their own markets. The effects of this policy, combined with the effects of their idiotic policy towards Moscow (which is what is meant herein wherever the words Russian or Russians are used) in the past, can be seen today. American exports are shrinking, her industrialists and financiers are pinched and becoming worried and, in their distress, favor a more liberal policy toward, and more trade with, Iron Curtain countries. They would even sell them the strategic items of which they (the Iron Curtain countries) are short—and thus (for the sake of a very temporary respite) speed up their own final destruction.

The American Government, having allowed itself to be pushed around for years and be maneuvered into one impossible position after another by Moscow, finds, or will find, itself damned as being intransigent by all and sundry. If and when it, at long last, tries to take a really strong stand—the sort of a stand it should have taken from the start.

Public Action, Inc.

One of the new and promising organized groups of citizens is Public Action, Inc., with headquarters at 131 East 69 Street, New York 21, N. Y.

Public Action furnishes a service for conservatives. Having excellent contacts in both Houses of Congress, it mails, from time to time, brief information on important pending legislation to its several thousand members, requesting each to write his or her Representative and two Senators to take some specified action. Membership fee is \$2 a year.

Mrs. Seth Milliken is Chairman; Miss Doris Fielding Reid, Vice Chairman and in charge of Washington activities; and Mrs. Amos Pinchot, secretary.

We commend Public Action to all our readers.

From Boston — of Course

Boston and the surrounding territory certainly go all out for "liberals," including some who are so liberal they play footsie with communism.

Castro of Cuba was the guest of the Harvard Law School Forum at Soldiers Field, Cambridge, Mass., on April 25.

The Harvard Alumni Bulletin for May 2, says that, "a sympathetic audience of about 10,000 students and guests... had their pockets apprehensively patted as they entered Soldiers Field and passed between lines of Mounted Police...."

In other words, in this once free country, hard by the cradle of American liberty, 10,000 supposedly respectable Americans were searched before being permitted to come within earshot of this highly suspicious guest.

How long, O Lord, how long?

Employer's Letter to His Employees

As you look at your paycheck this week, please look at the amount we actually paid you, not the final figure. Couldn't you use the difference to good advantage? The difference, which is *your* money, we must promptly send to the government for them to spend as those in authority deem wise.

What they are actually saying to you is, "We, the people you have elected, have decided that we know better than *you* how to spend *your* money."

They do the same to my paycheck and I don't like it. I think it is downright stupid. I think I can spend my paycheck, and that you can spend your paycheck, better than some man in a swivel chair living off the fat of the land in Washington, D. C.

Actually, the situation is ridiculous. We, the voters, elect these officials as our representatives. They run for office to get on your and my payroll. In short, they are supposed to be working for us. Then they turn around and tell us we are too dumb to spend our wages wisely. They can spend the money better.

If they are right, they are sane people and we are insane. They say they must be our guards and wardens. Since when has it been good policy to allow insane people to elect their guards? If they are correct, we shouldn't be allowed to vote.

Isn't it about time for us to look around for a representative who wants to reduce our taxes, and is not hellbent on giving us all these "free services" that cost us so much money?

Book Review

Dr. James C. Messersmith, former Director of Immigration Studies at the Southern Illinois University, has compiled an immense amount of fact with reference to United States immigration policy and published it under the title, *Illegal Entrants and Illegal Aliens in the United States*.

No student of immigration should fail to read this very compact and useful little volume—especially at this time when we are threatened with further weakening of our immigration laws. And every citizen should know of this constant alien threat.

Illegal Entrants and Illegal Aliens in the United States, published by Southern Illinois University, 184 pages, \$1.25.

Order direct from National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y.

This Council Letter may be quoted in whole or part provided due credit is given to the National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y., and quotation is specified to be from Economic Council Letter 454, May 15, 1959.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC., established in 1930, is a non-profit, non-partisan membership corporation organized under New York State law. It publishes the semi-monthly ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER and occasional ECONOMIC COUNCIL PAPERS. OFFICERS: President, Merwin K. Hart. Executive Vice President, Constance G. Dall. Vice Presidents: Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, U.S. M.C., retired, Vice Adm. C. S. Freeman, U.S.N., retired, Earl Harding, George S. Montgomery, Jr., Dr. Elwood Rowsey, A. Margaret Schmid, Ora A. Taylor; Secretary, McKay Twombly; Assistant Secretary, Sibylla Schilling; Treasurer, Baird Parks; Director of Research, Norman Dodd.

Subscription \$10 a year, \$6 for six months, \$3.50 for three months. Special rate for student or teacher \$5 a year.

Air Mail Subscription (domestic) \$12.00 a year, Air Mail (foreign) \$15.00 a year.

EXTRA COPIES of this Council Letter 15c each (8 for \$1), \$9 per 100, \$50 per 1,000.

Special prices will be quoted for larger quantities. Please add 3% sales tax for deliveries in Greater New York and 4% shipping charges on quantities of 100 or more.

National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y.
903 First National Bank Bldg., Utica 2, N. Y.